

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 27, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 27, 2003. The finality of the last Office Action mailed December 10, 2002 has been withdrawn. The allowability of claims 8-11, 14-16 and 20 have been withdrawn in view of recently discovered prior art.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11, 18 and 20 have been amended to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. Claims 12 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments presented herein. The amendments have been made in a good faith effort to advance prosecution on the merits. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,988,959 (*Sugata*). *Sugata* is generally directed to a framework of a damping structure for machine tools. The framework comprises a base unit, a delivery unit slidably fixed on the base unit and a column unit slidably disposed on the delivery unit. *Sugata*, however, does not teach or disclose a substrate-handling robot disposed on the upper mainframe to transfer a plurality of substrates between one or more cells. Accordingly, claims 1, 8 and 20 are patentable over *Sugata*. Claims 2, 4-6 and 21 are also patentable over *Sugata* since they depend from claims 1 and 20 respectively.

Claims 8, 10, 11 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,354,158 (*Sheldon*). *Sheldon* is generally directed to a six axis machine tool. The machine tool has a base platform and a spindle platform spaced from the base platform. The spaced platforms are joined together by six powered and extensible legs. The legs are formed of telescoping upper and lower parts. The telescoping parts may have a piston rod and a hydraulic cylinder. *Sheldon*, however, does not teach or disclose a substrate-handling robot disposed on the upper mainframe to transfer a plurality of substrates between one or more cells. Accordingly,

claims 8 and 11 are patentable over *Sheldon*. Claims 10 and 14-16 are also patentable over *Sheldon* since they depend from claims 8 and 11 respectively.

Claims 1-3 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 2,064,751 (*Hussman*) in view of US Patent No. 5,988,959 (*Sugata*). The Examiner takes the position that *Hussman* discloses all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the supporting member having a dampening means, which is sand. The Examiner attempts to supplement the missing limitation with *Sugata*.

Hussmann is generally directed to an anti-vibration base for supporting moving machinery and the like. A machine platform is disposed above the base. The platform has openings intermediate its edges and flanges formed adjacent the openings to provide greater rigidity to the platform. A plurality of springs is disposed between the base and the platform. *Hussmann*, however, does not teach, disclose or suggest a substrate-handling robot disposed on the upper mainframe to transfer a plurality of substrates between one or more cells.

As mentioned above, *Sugata* is generally directed to a framework of a damping structure for machine tools. Like *Hussmann*, *Sugata* does not teach, disclose or suggest a substrate-handling robot disposed on the upper mainframe to transfer a plurality of substrates between one or more cells.

Neither *Hussmann* nor *Sugata*, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses a substrate-handling robot disposed on the upper mainframe to transfer a plurality of substrates between one or more cells. Furthermore, there is no suggestion discerned in *Hussmann* or *Sugata* of modifying the devices or methods disclosed therein in the direction of the present invention, nor does there appear to be any suggestion of the desirability of such modifications. Therefore, claims 1 and 20 are patentable over *Hussmann* in view of *Sugata*. Claims 2-3, 18-19 and 21 are also patentable over *Hussmann* in view of *Sugata* since they depend from claims 1 and 20, respectively.

Claims 9, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable US Patent No. 5,354,158 (*Sheldon*) in view of US Patent No. 3,932,009 (*Zollinger*). The Examiner takes the position that *Sheldon* discloses all of the limitations

of the claimed invention except for the sand. The Examiner attempts to supplement the missing limitation with *Zollinger*.

As mentioned above, *Sheldon* is generally directed to a six axis machine tool and does not teach, disclose or suggest a substrate-handling robot disposed on the upper mainframe to transfer a plurality of substrates between one or more cells.

Zollinger is generally directed to a club table configured to supply articles, such as, glasses, bottles and the like, to the table surface without the necessity of transporting these articles to the table. The articles are stored in a central region of the table. *Zollinger*, however, does not teach, disclose or suggest a substrate-handling robot disposed on the upper mainframe to transfer a plurality of substrates between one or more cells.

Neither *Sheldon* nor *Zollinger*, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses a substrate-handling robot disposed on the upper mainframe to transfer a plurality of substrates between one or more cells. Furthermore, there is no suggestion discerned in *Sheldon* or *Zollinger* of modifying the devices or methods disclosed therein in the direction of the present invention, nor does there appear to be any suggestion of the desirability of such modifications. Therefore, claims 9 and 20 are patentable over *Sheldon* in view of *Zollinger*. Claim 21 is also patentable over *Sheldon* in view of *Zollinger* since it depends from claim 20.

Claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 12 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 12 and 13 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected various dependent claims. However, because the rejections to the respective base claims have been overcome, Applicants submit that the rejections for the dependent claims have been obviated.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed method or apparatus. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the